

United States Patent and Trademark Office

54

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N		
09/934,101	08/20/2001	Rolf Marggi	14100	7935		
25763	7590 10/04/2004	,	EXAM	EXAMINER		
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP			MENDEZ, MANUEL A			
	UAL PROPERTY DEPAR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER		
MINNEAPOL	JIS, MN 55402-1498	3763				

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/934,10	/934,101 MARGGI ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Manuel Me		3763			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati or Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	Idress		
THE i - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any i	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT assions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above; the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no ever tion. rs, a reply within the statu y period will apply and will by statute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. :ommunication.		
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>01 July 2004</u> .					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 and 21-27 Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	is/are withdrawn f					
Applicat	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Ex						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for to All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been cuments have been ne priority docume Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	l Stage		
2) Notice 3) Infor	ot(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-s mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC er No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	[·] O-152)		

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of **claims 9-20** in the reply filed on July 1, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that searching in Class 604 would not be a burden for the examiner. This is not found persuasive because class 604 includes hundreds of subclasses with each subclass containing hundreds of patents. Accordingly, in order to provide an adequate prosecution of this application, the requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-8 and 21-27 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on July 1, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsen, et al., in view of Funderburk, et al., and Teissen-Simony. The Larsen, et al., Patent discloses a cannula housing, a cannula extending from the cavity, a retaining body secured within the cavity and in cooperation with the internal surface to locate the flange within the cavity, and a needle holder. The Larsen, et al., Patent does not disclose a guide extending from the cannula. However, the use of guides extending

from cannulas is conventional in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Funderburk, et al. In figure 4, this patent shows a guide extending from a cannula and cooperating with a guide sleeve to position the connecting needle into a passage. Based on the observations made above, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the injection set disclosed by Larsen, et al., with a guide extending from the cannula would have been considered an obvious design choice.

Page 3

The examiner has also included the Teissen-Simony Patent in this rejection to further prove the conventionality of guides in infusion sets. Importantly, figure 8 shows guides (15,16) extending from a cannula to guide the connecting needle. Again, because of the conventionality of the guide configuration, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the injection set disclosed by Larsen, et al., with a guide extending from the cannula would have been considered an obvious design choice.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel Mendez whose telephone number is 703-308-2221. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Manuel Mendez Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3763

MM